

Appl. No. 09/610,033

Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The only rejection of record is a rejection under 35 USC 112 of claims for filing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner is taking the position that the requirement that the cellulose ester film be "transparent" is without support in the original application as filed. The Examiner states that applicants point to several discussions about haze and desirability of high light transmission, but the Examiner takes the position that such discussions and disclosures do not explicitly or implicitly support this conclusion that the cellulose ester film is transparent.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner points only to discussions about haze and desirability of high light transmittance as being insufficient. However, there is specific disclosure in the specification at page 1, under the Background of the Invention, that cellulose triacetate film is transparent and recently has been employed as a protective film for a polarizing plate of a liquid crystal

Appl. No. 09/610,033
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

display or a support for optical compensating films. The continuing discussion refers again to excellent light transmission, but notes the problem that it does not absorb ultra violet radiation. The discussion on page 3 speaks of specific prior art referring to transparent cellulose ester, but made by casting methods which have certain disadvantages. In the context of this background, the second paragraph on page 4 of the specification which refers to cellulose ester film formed by casting, which minimizes degradation of optical properties, etc. clearly supports that the optical properties are transparent.

Furthermore, in the context of the prior art disclosure concerning transparent material used for protecting polarizing plates and liquid crystal displays, the discussion on page 6 of the same uses, also supports that the prior art discussion of transparency applies to the present invention. The discussion at page 13, third paragraph, referring to UV absorbers which "absorb as little as possible visible light," also supports this meaning of the disclosure.

Furthermore, attention is directed to support at page 13, lines 16-17, "absorb as little of visible light", page 14, lines 11-12 referring to "minimal coloration"; page 15, lines 3-9

Appl. No. 09/610,033

Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

referring to maximum amounts of UV absorbers limited "due to the tendency of a decrease in transparency film" (emphasis added); page 18 line 1 disclosing that a "transparent film" is obtained; and page 21 lines 17-19 referring to "degradation of transmittance."

It is well established that a claimed invention need not be described *ipsis verbis* to satisfy the disclosure requirement of 35 USC 112 (Ex parte Holt, 19 USPQ 2nd 1211, 1213 (BPAI 1991)) if the meaning is in the specification (Ex parte Siegmund and Cole, 156 USPQ 477 (PTO Bd App 1967)).

In this application the term "transparency" is used at page 15. Page 18 refers to obtaining a "transparent film." Also, additional equivalent disclosure to "transparent" appears at other places (e.g. absorb little visible light), etc. as detailed above. It is therefore submitted that the specification fully supports the written description of the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application are therefore respectfully requested.


Appl. No. 09/610,033

Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman
& Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Ave., 16th Floor
New York, NY 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101
MJC/ld

Respectfully submitted,



MARSHALL J. CHICK
Reg. No. 26,853